

Rejection of Claims 1-5 Under 35 USC 103(a) (Paragraph 7 of Office Action)

Claims 1-5 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,919,730 to Gasper in view of U.S. Patent 6,020,115 to Orengo et al. for the reasons set forth in paragraph 7 of the Office Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal thereof are requested.

The present invention as recited in claim 1 relates to a photographic photosensitive material which either has only one of or none of a color correcting function for carrying out color correction of an image which has been subjected to developing processing and a sharpness enhancing function for enhancing sharpness of the image which has been subjected to developing processing, wherein an identification code is recorded on said photographic photosensitive material, said identification code expressing that said photographic photosensitive material either has only one of or none of said color correcting function and said sharpness enhancing function.

The media of the Gasper et al reference contain microdots embedded therein for providing a non-visual but machine detectable mark or marks. These microdots may be in the form of different repetitive patterns as a means of providing a unique signature to a document. The purpose of the microdots is to inhibit a copy machine from copying the document. See the

Abstract and col. 8, lines 15-17.

Orengo discloses a silver halide photographic material. See col. 12, lines 11-49, col. 4, lines 38-68, col. 13, line 56-col. 14, line 45, col. 23, lines 59-68, Example 1 and col. 24, lines 48-54.

In the present invention, the photographic photosensitive material itself either has only one of or none of the color correcting function and the sharpness enhancing function. Thus, one of or both of the functions is conducted by a digital printer. This type of photographic photosensitive material is intended to be processed by digital processing, and is thus referred to as a digital-processing film. If the user attempts to print the digital-processing film by an analog printer, the printing must not be allowed because adequate image quality cannot be obtained when a film not including a correction function is printed by an analog printer. The first feature of the present invention is to provide a technique for preventing a digital-processing film from being printed by an analog printer.

The second feature of the present invention is to set image processing parameters optimally, on the basis of the film ID, when the digital-processing film is printed by a digital printer.

In other words, one of the main objects of the present invention is to provide a photosensitive material to be used in a technique to transfer image quality correction functions from the

film to the digital processor, and in particular, in printing environments where both analog and digital printers may be used.

The Examiner states in the Office Action that the microdots of Gasper et al., which are used for copy protection, correspond to the identification code described in claim 1 of the present application. However, the identification code of the present invention is for recording information. On the basis of this information, subsequent processing is conducted on the photographic photosensitive material, as described on lines 6-10 in claim 1. None of the cited references disclose these features.

Also, there appears to be no suggestion in the cited references of recording an identification code onto a storage element provided at a cartridge accommodating the photographic material. This embodiment in claim 4 does not appear at all relevant to preventing the copying of an original document.

Moreover, the use of an optical or magnetic recording of the identification code instead of using microdots is not suggested by the Gasper reference. Indeed, such a substitution would destroy the teachings of the Gasper reference.

In summary, the documents of the Gasper et al. reference contain one or more microdots that are non-visual but machine detectable. The detected means for detecting the presence of these microdots in the document inhibits a copy machine from copying the document. However, neither of the references relied upon by the Examiner disclose an identification code on the

photographic photosensitive material which either has only one or none of a color correcting function for carrying out color correction of an image which has been subjected to developing processing or a sharpness enhancing function for enhancing sharpness of the image which has been subjected to developing processing. This combination of identification code and photographic material is clearly not suggested by the combination of the Gasper et al. and Orengo et al. references, especially since the instant identification code is for recording information. Therefore, the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn by the Examiner.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants hereby petition for an extension of three (3) months to October 12, 2000 in which to file a reply to the Office Action. The required fee of \$890.00 is enclosed herewith.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he is requested to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Serial No.: 09/374, 989

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP



By _____
Marc S. Weiner
Reg. No. 32,181
P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MSW/sh
1982-129P